



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Autronio, poenam de ambitu graviolem consules C. Antonius et Cicero sanxerunt, ut praeter haec veteribus legibus constituta etiam exilio multarentur."

If a writer in imperial times used the phrase "lex Cornelia" it would naturally be assumed that he was speaking of legislation by Sulla. Many instances of this could be cited from the *Digest* of Justinian. So Mommsen (*De Collegiis*, 44; *Strafrecht*, 867); Rinkes (*De Crimine Ambitus*, 52) and Greenidge (*Legal Procedure*, 423) think that a "lex Cornelia de ambitu" must be referred to Sulla, on the basis of the statements made by this scholiast, while Stangl (*Ciceronis Orationum Scholiastae*, II, 78), Meyer (*Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta*, 89), and Holden (*Ciceronis pro Plancio Oratio*, Introduction, xxvii) believe that the scholiast had in mind one of the much earlier Cornelian laws on the same subject.

In the year 181 a law on corrupt practices was proposed and carried by the consuls P. Cornelius and M. Baebius; "et leges de ambitu consules ex auctoritate senatus ad populum tulerunt" (Livy xl. 19). Again, about the year 159 a new law, commonly called the "lex Cornelia-Fulvia," was enacted: "lex de ambitu lata" (Livy, *Epit.* xlvii). We have no information about the contents of either of these laws.

Apart from a general probability that Sulla secured some form of legislation on the topic, the penalty mentioned by the scholiast as that prevailing "superioribus temporibus" fits the time of Sulla rather than the time of any of the earlier laws. The statement of Polybius (vi. 56) that at Carthage candidates openly purchased office, while at Rome men were punished for this by death, could not be true in the second century before Christ. And yet the penalties prescribed by Sulla for criminal offenses were usually less severe than before his time. It is impossible to believe that in the year 181 B.C., or in 159, the penalty would have been as mild as stated by the scholiast.

The words of the scholiast at the beginning of the sentence describing the penalties under the "lex Calpurnia" indicate that there was no long interval between the enactment of the "lex Calpurnia" and the enactment of the "lex Cornelia" which preceded it. The phrase "aliquanto postea" would be very inappropriate if an interval of 90, or 115, years was intended. We are forced, therefore, to conclude that, by an enactment of Sulla, the penalty for corrupt practices at election was fixed at exclusion from office for a period of ten years.

R. W. HUSBAND

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

HOMERICA

Δ 392: ἀψ ἀναερχομένῳ πυκινὸν λόχον εἶσαν ἄγοντες. So the MSS read, or else the metrically impossible ἀνερχομένῳ. The hiatus in ἀναερχομένῳ is of course highly suspicious. Barnes, observing the lack of anything for the participle to modify, wrote ἀψ οἱ ἀνερχομένῳ, and Bentley ἀψ ἄρ' ἀνερχομένῳ, but both do too much violence to the MSS tradition. Nobody seems to have thought of reading \mathcal{F} ', i.e., $\mathcal{F}(\alpha)$, which makes no change in the MSS tradition, and accounts for the hiatus (ἀψ ἀνά \mathcal{F} ' ἐρχομένῳ). Examples of the disappear-

ance of the third personal pronoun from the MSS when its vowel has suffered elision (e.g., Ω 154) are so numerous that they hardly need to be mentioned. Instances of the elision and consequent disappearance of the dative (φοι) may be found in Van Leeuwen, *Enchiridion Dictionis Epicae*, pp. 70-71.

Ω 41 ff.:

λέων δ' ὥς ἄγρια οἶδε
ὅς τ' ἐπεὶ ἄρ' μεγάλη τε βίη καὶ ἀγήνορι θυμῷ
εἷξας εἶσ' ἐπὶ μῆλα βροτῶν ἵνα δαῖτα λάβῃσι.

The difficulty with this passage, of course, is that there are two relatives (ὅς and ἐπεὶ) and only one finite verb (εἶσι). Most attempts at emendation have centered around the idea of getting two verbs, usually by changing εἷξας into a finite verb (εἷξῃσ' Nicanor, *φείξασκ'* Bentley). Nauck suggested that the trouble might lie in ἐπεὶ ἄρ', but he did not attempt to diagnose the case further. It seems perhaps possible, by the change of one letter, to get a simple and rational reading, i.e., ΟΣ ΤΕ ΦΕΙ (i.e., ὅς τε ἦ. Compare just above, Ω 36, ἦ τ' ἀλόχῳ . . . καὶ μητέρῃ.). On the assumption that this was the original reading it is easy enough to explain how a scribe, failing to apprehend it and having in mind the more famous and elaborate comparison of P 657 ff., changed the φ into π to correspond with the ὅς τ' ἐπεὶ ἄρ' . . . at the beginning of P 658, and so spoiled grammar and sense; for ἐπεὶ in a generalizing clause would naturally call for the subjunctive (as in P 658 and in many other places), while ὅς in a clause of particular description would properly be construed with the indicative (as in P 664, II 755, *et al.*), and the elegant manner of keeping the verb in reserve in P 657 ff. only serves to emphasize the inelegance of a missing verb in this particular place. Instances of the corruption of φ to π are naturally not numerous, since the tendency, of course, would be to substitute familiar and colorless words like τ' (τε) or ῥ' (ῥα). In Hesychius words beginning with φ are usually listed under Γ or Β (Γόινος·οἶνος. Γίσγον·ἵσον. Βεΐκατι·εἵκοσι, Λάκωνες). Perhaps, however, we may recognize φ in παγὰς (i.e., φαγὰς). γῆ τις ὑπὸ τῶν γεωργῶν, in πεπωγμένον (i.e., φεφωγμένον, perf. of ἄγνυμι). κεκλασμένον, in πολλέων (i.e., φολλέων). πολυκίνητος, and in some other words in Hesychius. Van Herwerden, *Lex. Graec. suppl. et dialect.*, quotes also (s.v. ἄτα) ἄπατος (i.e., ἄφατος). ἀθῶος, ἀζήμιος. However, there is no need to go so far afield as Hesychius, since in our MSS examples of the garbling of Vau are extremely plentiful. One need only glance through Van Leeuwen's text to assure himself of the wholesale fashion in which it has been done. Is this (Ω 42) still another case?

FRANK COLE BABBITT

TRINITY COLLEGE

THE ABU SYMBEL INSCRIPTION AND MODERN CHARACTERS

A striking illustration of the extent to which we unconsciously make use of the heritage of classical antiquity was brought home to me some time ago by an experiment with the letters of a Greek inscription.

Observing that the characters in one of the Abu Symbel inscriptions were very much like the corresponding ones in use today, it occurred to me that it